

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.49 OF 2005

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3000 OF 2002

VISHWANATH U. MADA & ORS. PETITIONERS.

Vs.

THE COLLECTOR MUMBAI SUBURBAN

DISTRICT & ORS. RESPONDENTS.

AND.

THE SECRETARY, URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT, STATE OF MAHARARAHSTRA

AND ANR. CONTEMNORS.

MR. RUSTOM KHAN I/B. PRAVIN MEHTA AND P.M. & MITHI &
CO. FOR THE PETITIONER.

MR. K.R.BELOSAY FOR RESPONDENT NO.1.

MR. J.S.SALUJA I/B. M.V. KINI AND CO. FOR RESPONDENT
NO.3.

MS. A.R.JOSHI FOR RESPONDENT NO.2.

MR. CHINTAMANI, DEPUTY ENGINEER MHADA PRSENT.

MR. BODKE, DEPUTY COLLECTOR PRESENT.

MR. P.K.DAS MEMBER OF MONITORING COMMITTEE PRESENT.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. The Airport Authority of India is represented,

the Deputy Collector Mr. Bodke is present in person, Mr. P.K.Das, the Member of Monitoring Committee appointed by the Court is present, Bombay Municipal Corporation is represented by the advocate, the Additional Commissioner of Bombay Municipal Corporation is present in Court, who is also the Chairman of the Committee appointed by the Court, Mr. Chintamani, the Deputy Engineer of MHADA is present.

2. Perused the affidavit filed by the Deputy Collector Mr. Bodke. In paragraph No. 3(ii) of the affidavit, it is mentioned that the implementation of relocation of all the stall holders physically is the responsibility of the Officers of the Slum Improvement Board, MHADA who were directed by the Monitoring Committee for immediate action and to convey the date by which, the relocation will be completed. The affidavit further states that the said authority has now produced a letter dated 2.3.2006 by which they have conveyed their report that the entire relocation will be completed within a period of four months subject to clearance from B.M.C., M.C.Z.M.A., Collector MSJ and Airport Authority of India and on receipt of balance payment from the rest of the stall holders for construction of the stalls.

3. A Statement has been made by taking instructions from Mr. Bodke, the Deputy Collector that the balance payment out of Rs. 35,000/- has been received from rest of the stall holders for the construction of the

stalls.

4. The learned Counsel representing the aforesaid authorities further state that now there is no hindrance in completing the relocation of the stall holders by constructing new stalls by the Implementing Authority, i.e.MHADA.

5. In the affidavit in paragraph 4, it has been mentioned that " all the stall holders are also in arrears of lease rent in respect of the Government land, occupied by them. Orders are passed by the Collector for payment of the said amount. No relocation of such stall holders may be possible till the said amount is recovered from all such stall holders." Learned Counsel representing the authority states that the Deputy Collector Mr. Bodke, who has filed this affidavit and who is present in Court, withdraws the aforesaid statements stating that necessary action for recovery of arrears would be taken and if arrears are not paid, appropriate action would be taken under the provisions of the law.

6. So far as the period of four months, which is asked for, for completing the entire relocation is much on higher side. The directions, which were originally given required everything to be completed, including the relocation of the stall holders, within a period of twelve weeks. Asking again for a period of four months now is not just and proper. It is, therefore, directed

that the entire relocation shall be completed within a period of two months from today.

7. All the Authorities are present before the Court. Whatever is required to be done by each of the Authorities towards completing the work of relocation, shall be done expeditiously so that the relocation is completed within a period of two months from today. The Relocation shall be completed and carried out under the supervision and directions of the Monitoring Committee appointed by the Court.

8. With these directions, the contempt petition stands disposed of.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.66 OF 2005

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3108 OF 2004

CAPT. NIKHIL NEVERKAR

& ANR.

... PETITIONER.

VS.

AIR INDIA LTD. & ORS.

... RESPONDENTS.

MR. VIBHAV KRISHNA WITH MAHESH LONDHE I/B. S. UDESHI
& CO. FOR THE PETITIONER.

MR. GIRISH KULKARNI WITH S.J.SALUJA I/B. M.V.KINI &
CO. FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 2 & 3.

MS. GEETA SHATRI FOR RESPONDENT NO.6.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel on both sides.

2. Petition is admitted.

3. Issue show cause notice against the Respondent
Nos. 1 to 5 as to why action should not be taken
against them for having committed contempt of the Order
of this Court, dated 10.3.2005, returnable within four

weeks.

4. Matter to come up after six weeks.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.65 OF 2005

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 1512 OF 2004

SARABJEEP SINGH & ORS. ... PETITIONERS.

VS.

AIR INDIA LTD. & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

MR. VIBHAV KRISHNA WITH MR. MAHESH LONDHE I/B. SANJAY
UDESHI FOR THE PETITIONERS.

MR. GIRISH KULKARNI WITH MR. J.S.SALUJA I/B. M.V.KINI
& CO. FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 2 & 3.

MS. GEETA SHASTRI FOR RESPONDENT NO. 6.

NIRANJAN SHIMPI FOR RESPONDENT NO. 9 AND 10.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel on both sides.

2. Petition is admitted.

3. Issue show cause notice against the Respondent
Nos. 1 to 7 as to why action should not be taken
against them for having committed contempt of the Order
of this Court, dated 10.3.2005, returnable within four

weeks.

4. Matter to come up after six weeks.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.18 OF 2005

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3108 OF 2004

CAPT. VISHAL CAPOOR & ORS. ... PETITIONERS.

VS.

AIR INDIA LTD. & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

MR. VIBHAV KRISHNA WITH MR. MAHESH LONDHE I/B. SANJAY
UDESHI FOR THE PETITIONERS.

MR. GIRISH KULKARNI WITH MR. J.S.SALUJA I/B. M.V.KINI
& CO. FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 1,2 & 3.

MS. GEETA SHASTRI FOR RESPONDENT NO. 6.

NIRANJAN SHIMPI FOR RESPONDENT NO. 9 TO 22.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel on both sides.

2. Petition is admitted.

3. Issue show cause notice against the Respondent
Nos. 1 to 7 as to why action should not be taken
against them for having committed contempt of the Order

of this Court, dated 10.3.2005, returnable within four weeks.

4. Matter to come up after six weeks.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.4 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 3182 OF 2004

BRIHANMUMBAI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ...PETITIONERS.

VS.

MR. ANIL LAXMAN KARPE ...RESPONDENT.

MR. H. TOOR I/B. C. BAYLEY & CO. FOR THE PETITIONERS.

MR. M.R.DESHPANDE FOR THE RESPONDENT.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard.

2. Admit.

3. Issue show cause notice against the Respondent

as to why action should not be taken against him for having committed contempt of the Order, of this Court, dated 12.1.2005, returnable within two weeks.

4. Matter to come up after three weeks.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.12 OF 2006

IN

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 3906 OF 2005

IN

SUIT NO. 3356 OF 2005

RAJENDRA VINAYAK VICHARE ... PETITIONER.

VS.

VICHARE COURIER SERVICES

PVT.LTD. & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

MR. P.K.SAMDEN I/B. WITH MR. SUNIL PUROHIT I/B. BERI
& CO. FOR THE PETITIONER.

MR. A.S.KHAN FOR RESPONDENTS.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. The learned Counsel for the Respondent seeks time to file reply. Time granted.

2. S.O. for two weeks.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.43 OF 2005
IN
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1375 OF 2002
IN
SUIT NO. 1807 OF 2002

NARAYAN G. NIKOSE & ANR. ... PETITIONERS.

VS.

MHADA & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

VIJAY NAIR I/B. N. BHATT FOR THE PETITIONERS.

MR. MATTOS FOR RESPONDENTS.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. The parties have filed Minutes of Order. The Minutes of Order taken on record and marked 'X' for

identification.

2. The Contempt Petition is disposed of in view of the Minutes of the Order.

3. Certified Copy expedited.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.14 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 78 OF 2006

MRS. PARVATI S. KHANDEKAR ... PETITIONER.

VS.

NAIGAON EDUCATION SOCIETY & ORS... RESPONDENTS.

MR. SUNIL DIGHE FOR THE PETITIONER.

NONE FOR THE RESPONDENTS.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Issue notice to the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3, returnable within one week. Hamdust allowed.

2. S.O. for one week.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
SHOW CAUSE NOTICE NO. 64 OF 2005
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.71 OF 2004
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2763 OF 2002

CAPT.KERSY RATONSHA

DRIVER PETITIONER.

VS.

THE COLLECTOR OF CHENNAI

& ORS. RESPONDENTS.

MR. C.R.NAIDU I/B. M/S. C.R.NAIDU AND CO. FOR THE
PETITIONER.

MR. D.H.MEHTA SR.COUNSEL WITH SAMIR SAMANT FOR
RESPONDENT NOS. 3 TO 6.

MR. TIRUPATI KUMAR KHEMKA, RESPONDENT NO. 6 PRESENT.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. Respondent NO. 6 present in Court. The learned Counsel representing Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 submits that they will file affidavit disclosing their movable and immovable properties, within four weeks.

2. The learned Counsel for the Respondents also submits that he be given time to cheque whether the amount of Income Tax as contemplated in prayer clause (b) in the Writ Petitioner, has been deposited or otherwise with the Income Tax Department. He is granted eight weeks' time for the same.

3. Matter to come up after eight weeks. Any of the Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 shall remain present in Court on the dates fixed in the matter.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE NO. 108 OF 2005

IN

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1 OF 2005

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 1942 OF 1995

P.G.KUSHTE & ORS. ... PETITIONER.

VS.

PRAGAT SHIKSHAN SANSTHA

& ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

MANISH MISTRY I/B. M.M.VASHI FOR THE PETITIONER.

NONE FOR THE RESPONDENTS.

Coram : S.K.Shah, J.

Date : March 3, 2006.

P.C.

1. It appears that the Show Cause Notice is served only on Respondent Nos. 1 and 2. None present. Issue bailable warrant against Respondent No.2 in the sum of Rs. 5000/-, returnable on 31st March, 2006.

2. The Notice appears not to have been served on Respondent Nos. 3 and 4. Hence, re-issue Show Cause Notice to Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 returnable within four weeks.

3. Matter to come up on 31st March, 2006.

....

[S.K.Shah , J.]